

205
2

AN
A N S W E R
TO SOME
E X C E P T I O N S
IN
B I S H O P B U R N E T ' s
Third Part of the
H I S T O R Y of the R E F O R M A T I O N , &c.
AGAINST
M r . C O L L I E R ' s
Ecclesiastical History.

Together with

A R E P L Y to some **R E M A R K S** in Bishop
NICHOLSON's English Historical Library, &c. upon the
same Subject.

By J E R . C O L L I E R , M . A .



L O N D O N :

Printed for RICHARD SARE, JOHN NICHOLSON, BENJAMIN TOOK, DANIEL MID-WINTER and GEORGE STRAHAN. 1715.

74

AMERICAN BISHOP BUREAU EXCEP'TIONAL INSTITUTE

28. МОИАМЕРИКАНСКИЕ УЧЕБНИКИ

M. O. L. L. E R S

McClellan High School



А.М. АЛЛАГОВИЧ

W A Y N E



A N S W E R
TO SOME
E X C E P T I O N S
Bishop Burnet's
Third Part of the
H I S T O R Y of the R E F O R M A T I O N, &c.



These Papers being written before Bishop Burnet's Death, the Reader is desired to take them as they were.

The learned Author of the *History of our English Reformation*, has in his third part lately publish'd, made some Animadversions on the second Volume of my *Ecclesiastical History*. ^a What he has offer'd upon this Subject is so gentle and inoffensive in the Proof, that at first I was unresolv'd about an Answer: But considering he is pleas'd to question my Integrity in no small Instance, and charge me with unfair Representation: That I sit hard on the Memory of our reforming Princes, and varnish the Character of those of a different Persuasion. Since he has given the Reader

^a Bp. Burnet,
Hist. Reform.
Part III.
Pref. p. 2. to
p. 6.

Warning of my Book, for fear it might infect his Orthodoxy, and lead him into some dangerous Mistakes: These things consider'd, I thought a few Pages, by way of return, might not be unnecessary: I say a few Pages, for as for any length of Vindication, he has given no manner of Occasion for't.

This learned Prelate offers four Instances to shew with what Principle, Spirit and Design I set out: And all these, by his Insinuation, are much out of Order. ^b To examine these as ^b Id. Pref. they lie. Becket comes up first: And here I ^b pag. 3. have asserted, that tho' this Archbishop's *Conduct in his Dispute with King Henry II.* was not altogether defensible, he was far however from being guilty of that gross Mismanagement with which he is charged. The Bishop's Remark is this: *I will leave the Judgment that must be pass'd upon this Period, to all who are in any sort acquainted with the History of that*

A 2 Time ^c.

^c Id. Pref.
pag. 3.

Time ^c. As much as to say, the Relation is romantick, and clearly contrary to Matter of Fact. What I have advanced by way of

Migration for ~~Becket~~, is taken from contemporary Authors of the best Authority; from *Hawkes* and *Woodstock*, from *Quadrilogus* and *Acta* of *Canterbury*. And does this Reverend Prelate produce any counter Testimony better than thicke? No. Does he offer any Proof from any Inconsistency in the Account, from any high Improbability in Substance or Circumstance? Nothing of this either. He affords no more than bare Assertion for the Point. If we won't resign to

your Belief, with against Evidence, and take his Word for the Controversy; we must keep our old Opinion, for here's no Light let in to inform us farther.

This learned Prelate at his *Triennial Visit*^d after some other unsupported *Recharge*, p. 63. An. 1714. marks, makes the softening Becket's Behaviour one Article. And yet he's so frank as to confess he never read my first *Volume*; and yet there's a Reference of ten Pages to this History in my second *Volume*, to justifie the softening objected, and that in the very Place cited by this learned Prelate. Now what incomprehensible Justice is it to give Sentence without hearing the Cause; to censure an Author without reading him; especially when he refers to Evidence, and points directly to a Defence?

But this learned Prelate had given a different Account of this Matter, and called in a very unfourtunate *Vouchee*. ^e His Author is one *William Thomas*: This *Thomas* was a flaming Rebel, advis'd the assassinating Queen *Mary*, for which *Wyat* abhor'd him, stabb'd himself with a Pen-knife in the *Tower*, and justifly'd his Treason at his Execution. Now whether

a Person of this Temper and Principles, who flatter'd the Memory of *Henry VIII*.^f and wrote almost four hundred Years after Becket's time; whether, I say, the Report of such a Person as this ought to weigh down the Authority of eight or nine Historians who liv'd at the Time of the Transaction, had fair Opportunities of knowing the Truth, and lay under no exceptionable Character, I leave the Reader to judge. But notwithstanding Becket has a Discharge from the hardest Imputations, his whole Conduct does not pass without Dislike.

To mention something of the Dispute between King *Henry II*. and him: He is blamed for going upon insufficient Grounds in the Controversy. That possibly he overlook'd the later Constitutions in the *Theodosian* and *Justinian Codes*, or rested too much on the Canon Law,^g That the Exemption of Clerks from the Civil Courts was no Right inseparable from their Order, but only a Privilege granted by the Crown. And therefore since the Parliament at *Clarendon* had revok'd this Concession, the Archbishop ought not to have insisted on it.^h He is blam'd for fluctuating and Inconstancy, for engaging and retracting, and quitting the Kingdom without the King's leave. He is farther censur'd for refusing to return to his See upon the most advantageous Precedents, and the best Terms enjoy'd by any of his Predecessors: And for breaking

off the Accommodation only for being deny'd the *Kiss of Peace*. His Tenant, that the Civil Government receiv'd its Authority from the Church, is mark'd as a false Principle, and a grand Mistake. And lastly His excommunicating the Archbishop of *York* for crowning the young King, and not waiting his Right at so nice a Juncture, is mark'd as unfeiable Schismatics. And now I hope his point's clear, that tho' I am willing to do Justice to everybody, I was not bias'd with any Partiality to Archbishop *Becket*.

To proceed. This learned Prelate complains of my having represent'd King *Edward VI*. under a Character of Infamy.

That he was tintur'd with *Erasian Principles*, and seems to have had no Notion of Sacrilege; and that most of the Hardships put upon the Church, happen'd in the latter end of his Reign, when his Judgment was in the best Condition.^k ^k Bp. Burnet, Hist. Part. III. pag. 3.

I grant all this is said; and for the Truth of the Remark, besides other Proof from History and Records, I vouch'd this Prince's Remains in the *Cotton Library*.

This learned Prelate being not prepar'd to disprove the Narrative, applies to another Expedient. He makes it a Fault, that these severe Reflections (as he calls them) are not corretted. This looks like impracticable Advice: For which way can Truth be corrected unless by delivering that which is false? But I conclude immediately with his Death, without adding a Word of his good Qualities! As to the bright part of this King's Character, I had given it to a considerable length just before; and to what purpose would it have been to have cloy'd the Reader with Repetition?

And here it may be farther consider'd, this Prince was deep in his Minority, not sixteen at his Death; and therefore all Misfortune in his Conduct and Principles, must fall upon those who form'd his Education, and govern'd his Person. Now that those who sway'd in the Court, and sat at the Helm, were not Men of Regularity, and stanch Conscienced, is largely confess'd by this Reverend Prelate. To produce some Instances:

He reports a memorable ^m Passage from Ridley's Life. That when this Bishop had bestow'd a Prebend in St. Paul's upon *Grindall*, ^m Bp. Burnet, Part III. p. 197. "He receiv'd a Letter from the Council to stop Collation: For the King was to keep that Prebend for the Furniture of his Stable." So that it seems the Horses made part of the Chapter. At the close of this Reign he observes, *The untimely End of this Prince was look'd on as a just Judgment of God, upon those who pretended to love and promote a Reformation; but whose impious and flagitious Lives were a Reproach to it.* The open Lewdness in which many lived, without Shame or Remorse, gave great Occasion to their Adversaries to say, *they were in the right to assert Justification by Faith without Works, since they were, as to every good Work, Reprobate.* Their gross and insatiable scrambling after the Goods and Wealth, that had been dedicated with good Designs, tho' to superstitious Uses, without applying any part of it to the promoting the Gospel, the instructing the Youth, or relieving the Poor, made all People conclude, that it was for Robbery, and not for Reformation, that their Zeal made

^g Collier, Eccl. Hist. Vol. I. p. 373.

^h Id. p. 374.

^r Id. Part III. made them so active n. To this he subjoyns
p. 216. an authentick Account of the Court's indi-
rect Dealing with respect to the Deanary of
Norwich.

• Id. p. 218.

Our learned Historian goes on, to lament the want of Probity and Christian Behaviour in the Politicians and Grand Monde, in a very solemn and tragical Strain. He ° reports, These Men of Distinction Talk'd of the Purity of the Gospel, while they were wallowing in all Sensuality and Uncleanness; pretending to put all their Confidence in the Merits and Sufferings of Christ, while they were crucifying him afresh, and putting him to open Shame. That there was no redress of crying Abuses, to be expected from the Men in Power, because they found their Account too evidently in them. That these were Men in whose Hands things grew every Day worse and worse; whose Arrogance, and other Disorders, our chief Reformers were forc'd in some measure to connive at, that they might not provoke them to retard a Work, that could in no wise be carry'd on without their Countenance and Authority, tho' they saw the Prejudice it brought upon them to be oblig'd to apply to, and to make use of, such Tools. That the righteous Souls of our best Reformers were much griev'd to find themselves engag'd with Men that were ready to pull down, especially when any thing was to be got by it; but were as backward in building up, as They were forward in plucking down. So that They seem'd to design to leave all in a great Ruine. These were Hindrances to the progress of the Reformation, as they were both the Burthen, and the Shame of our Reformers. Our Author, in the Page before this,

* Id. p. 217. * has a great deal more to the same purpose.

11

'Tis true this Reverend Prelate confines the Mal-administration chiefly to the Beginning of this Reign, as if Matters mended upon the Course †: But this Account is quickly retracted, for in the next Leaf ‡ he recollects himself, and assures us, that *Things grew every day worse and worse.*

Now after all this Keenes and Length of Satyr, I desire he would please to recall his Censure, and not charge me with over-loading the Administration; and discovering a particular Virulence against the Memory of this

His third Instance to discover the Mysterious Principles, and Design with which I wrote, relates to *Mary Queen of Scots*. The dangerous *Words* are These; *Her Fortitude and Devotion* were very remarkable: *She supported her Character, with all imaginable Decency, and dyed like a Christian, and a Queen*^q.

^a Collier.
Ecccl. Hist.
Vol. II. p. 601.
Bp. Burnet,
Pt. III.
Pref. p. 3.
^r Cambden.

And what harm is there in this? Tis no more than bare Justice to her Memory. Even *Cambden* gives her a larger Commendation than this comes to: And which is more, Queen *Elizabeth* is deeply censured for breach of promise; for confining and maltreating this Princess: And lastly, for bringing an Independent Queen her Cousin; first to her Tryal, (where she had not the benefit of the Law,) and then to the *Block*.^r

Eliz. But *Mary Queen of Scots* was a Roman Catholick, therefore a good word is too much for Her. To what purpose else can this passage be cited? But this Learned Prelate was of another mind last Summer. For at the

Salisbury Visitation, He throws in a clause for candid Construction, and good Usage. He declares his Heart is full of personal Charity for Papists; And thanks God for this benevolent Disposition. That He has known many Good Men amongst them, and loved them particularly. And since, within the Bishop's Acquaintance, many Papists are good Men, why might not this Queen of Scots be a good Woman, and a Princess of great Magnanimity, as Cambden reports Her? And if so, tis pretty plain, Her Character is not over-flourish'd.

The last exceptionable Instance is taken from a short parallel, drawn between Queen Elizabeth, and her Sister Queen Mary, with Reference to the Church. And here this Learned Prelate, tho' he gives no reason for't, would have his *Reader* believe the Comparison leans too much to the Advantage of the latter ^t. To this I answer,

1st, The Parallel runs all by way of Quere, and nothing is directly asserted. My words stand thus: *May it not be affirm'd the one made Martyrs in the Church, the other Beggers? The one executed the Men, and the other the Estates? And therefore reserving the Honour of the Reformation to Queen Elizabeth, the Question will be whether the Resuming the First Fruits and Tents, putting many Vicarages in a deplorable Condition, and settling a perpetuity of poverty on the Church, was not much more prejudicial than Fire and Faggot? &c^u.* Thus we see every Thing is put by way of Question; and refer'd to the Reader's Decision. And where nothing is affirm'd, one might have hoped, nothing would have been charg'd.

But 2dly, Supposing these Queres turn'd into Affirmations, which is more than the words will bear, are not the Facts undoubted, and the Inferences beyond contradiction? Is not Queen *Mary* said to have *made Martyrs*? And does the persecuting Truth, and burning People for Orthodoxy, come near a Commendation? The Honour of the *Reformation* is reserved for Queen *Elizabeth*: And is not this a remarkable Preference? on the other side, were not all the Impropriations vested in the *Crown*, were not the *First Fruits* and *Tenths*, return'd by Queen *Mary* to the Church? This laist our Learned Historian commends as a *noble Instance of Bounty*^{w.} He ^{w Bp. Burnet's} likewise observes that Impropriations are the ^{Hist. Pt. III.} True *Patrimony of the Church*, and that ^{p. 331.} the granting them away, has put a great part of our *Clergy* under crying *Necessities*^{x.} x *Ibid.*

And does not Queen Elizabeth's conduct fall under Disadvantage upon both these Considerations? Does not Poverty in the Clergy breed Ignorance and Contempt; call them off from their Business, and weaken their Character? And must not the *Laity* be losers in their Biggest Interest, and suffer deeply upon this score? without doubt they must, unless Christianity is an imposturous Contrivance, and Heaven and Hell no better than *Romance*. What Bishop of primitive Conscience and Courage would not willingly go to the Stake to rescue Religion from such a state of Impotence? Now that these *crying Necessities* were in a great measure brought upon the Church by Queen Elizabeth's Admini-

stration, is too evident to be deny'd: And to come somewhat closer, is sufficiently confess'd by this Learned Historian. And therefore for ought any thing that has hitherto appear'd, I may have as disinterested and defensible a Notion of the Happiness or Misery of a

^y Bp. Burnet's ^z Churc^h, as this Reverend Prelate ^y.

Pref. p. 4.

* Id. ibid.

^z Id. Hist. Ref.
Pt. II.
Book 1. p. 149.
compared with
Hist. Ref.

Pt. III.

Pref. p. 4.

^a Pag. 144.

^b Pag. 4.

^c 5, 6 Edw. 6.
cap. 1.

^d De Minist.
Anglic. p. 356.

^e Id. pag. 357, England, was observ'd at this Solemnity ^e.

358.

Now at Parker's Consecration the Instrument informs us in so many words, that there was

^f Nullum Ar- no Pastoral Staff put into his Hands ^f. Thus chiepisco- the Reader may see if I was somewhat mista- tradens Pasto- ken, I had good Authority for my excuse.

^g Supplement to Morery's Di- that the Ordinall in the Common Prayer Book etionary. printed by Richard Grafton, An. 1552, and Article.

Parker. now in the Lambeth Library, tho' it mentions nothing of putting the Pastoral Staff in the

Eccles. Hist. Vol. 2. p. 461. consecrated Bishop's Hand, nor that the Con-

secrating Bishops had this Mark of Authority in theirs; yet there is a Manuscript Marginal Note, for putting the Pastoral Staff into the consecrated Bishop's Hand: And this Note has a line struck through for Deletion.

Now, notwithstanding from this Deletion and the Print, we may certainly conclude this Ceremony was then omitted: However, this Marginal Hint seems to refer to a former Custom, and possibly to what was practis'd since the Reformation: But whether enjoyed by the Ordinall of 1549, is more than can be clearly infer'd.

But granting this Note refers to the Ordinall last mention'd, this Learned Prelate may lose by the concession another way: For the Ordinall printed by Grafton and Whitchurch, An.

1552, ^g tells us nothing of a Chalice, either with Bread in't, or without it, put into the Priest's hand, neither is there any written Marginal Note to point towards any such Ceremony practis'd since the Reformation. Thus Mason

^g In the Lam-
beth Library.

is positive that no consecrated Plate was delivered to the Priest by the Reform'd Ordinall ^h.

^h Mason.
De Minist.
Anglic.

ⁱ Bp. Burnet's
Hist. Ref.

Pt. II. p. 144.
Pt. III. Pref.

^j Bp. Burnet
P. 4.

^k Bp. Burnet
Ibid.

2dly, There's not only omission, but contradiction, between the Reports of this matter. In the 2d Part of his History of the Reformation, This Learned Prelate affirms,

^a that by the first Reform'd Ordinall, there was nothing more in the Consecration of a Bishop, than what is now in use, save that a Staff was put into his Hand with this Blessing. Be to the Flock of Christ a Shepherd.

^b He tells us the Rubrick appoints the Archbishop to lay the Bible on the consecrated Bishop's Neck, and say give heed to Reading.

The Ordinalls perus'd by me were printed by Grafton and Whitchurch, in the year 1552.

I thought them then the first Editions, but am now convinc'd there was an Ordinall publish'd in 1549. However, That this last

mention'd, differs from the other two, is more than I can yield, till better inform'd.

My Reasons are, (1st,) because neither the Act of Parliament, which confirms the Ordinall ^c,

nor the Church where she speaks to this matter in her Articles, takes notice of any Alteration. I cite the Act of Parliament,

because tho' it mentions Alterations in the Common Prayer, there is nothing said of any Difference in the Ordinall. (2dly,) Mason

who liv'd in Queen Elizabeth's Reign, wrote upon this Argument, and one would think should know matter of Fact;

This famous Defender of the English Clergy, affests expressly, that the Ring, the Pastoral Staff, the Oyl, &c. were retrench'd in the Reform'd Ordinall ^d.

That Parker was the first Archbishop consecrated by this New Ordinall: And that the same Form us'd in the Reign of Edward VI. and still retain'd in the Church of

^e See my Ec-
cles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 288,
289, 290.

Now therefore I must crave an Oyer of the Record; for till the Book appears, I cannot resign.

After enquiry in other places, I saw this Ordinall in the Lambeth Catalogue. The Class, and Figures, are particularly mark'd:

But upon a diligent search, neither the Number for Direction, nor the Book are to be found: 'tis therefore either lost, or much mislaid.

I'm sorry I mis'd succeeding, because twas here the Bishop saw it lately, and Hither He appeals ^m.

I have waited several Weeks for this Book: And going again to Lambeth, I'm inform'd the

Archbishop has taken it out of the Library into his Study: But an Accident having lately happen'd in his Family, 'twas not thought proper to trouble Him for a fight on't. Here

I saw Dr. Gibson's Codex Canonum, &c. who referring to this Ordinall, mentions the Pastoral Staff put into the Bishop's Hand, and the Chalice with Bread, into the Priest's:

Now if this Gentleman transcrib'd from the Ordinall, (which seems probable) and not from Bishop Burnet's Second Part of the History of the Reformation; I must own my self mistaken: supposing this, the Grounds I went upon, had strong appearances of Truth.

I confess the Doctor's making his References to 3 and 5 E. VI. is what I don't perfectly understand. For the first Ordinall was drawn in the 3d, and publish'd in March, when the 4th Year of this Reign was newly begun. In the 5th and 6th Year of

this

this Prince, the *Common-Prayer* Review'd was confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*, and printed by *Grafton* with the *Ordinall* annext, in which the Ceremonies above-mention'd are all omitted. But if the Dr's References are either mis-printed, or elsewhere explain'd, my doubt is so far satisfy'd. After all, inspecting the *Book* is the fullest Evidence. And here if the *View* happens to go against me, I can better afford to be somewhat mistaken than the Bishop. For granting him right in this Remark, he is plainly wrong in all the rest.

This Learned Prelate charges me with changing a very material *Word* in the *Rubrick* of the *Common Prayer* in K. Edward's time. The Design of this *Rubrick*, made at the *Review* of the *Liturgy*, was for explaining the Posture of Kneeling at the *Eucharist*, to an inoffensive Sence. And where lies the exceptionable *Word*? 'Tis in putting **Corporal Presence**, of *Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood*, instead of **Real and Essential**ⁿ. This Alteration it seems brings up a very different Meaning, for the *Affutors of Transubstantiation*, neither do, nor can pretend, there's any such *Corporal Presence*: No; They affirm the Body is not present *Corporally*, but *Spiritually*, or as a Spirit is present^o. To this I answer, that notwithstanding it has so happen'd that *Corporal* is put instead of *Real and Essential*, this Change of the Terms is not at all material. Which I shall prove,

1st. From the *Rubrick* in K. Edward's Reign.

2^{dly}. From the Doctrine of the Church of Rome.

1st. From the *Rubrick*. This Direction, as this Learned Prelate reports it, declares, That by Kneeling no Adoration is intended to any **Real and Essential Presence** of *Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood*. For the *Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour* are in Heaven, and not here: It being against the Truth of *Christ's Natural Body*, to be at one time in more places than one.

From hence 'tis plain, that **Real**, and **Essential**, and **Corporal Presence**, are Terms of an equivalent, and tantamount Sence. For the *Rubrick* informs us, there's no Adoration intended to the *Real and Essential Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood*. Why so? Because the *Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour*, are in Heaven, and not here: It being against the Truth of *Christ's Natural Body* to be at one time, in more places than one.

The *Rubrick* goes upon this Ground: Where our Saviour's *Natural Flesh and Blood*, are really and essentially present; they must be present in the Essential Properties of a Body. That is, to say nothing farther, They must have *partes extra partes*, be extended, and impenetrable: But such a *Presence*, the *Rubrick* tells us, is impossible, because 'tis against the Truth of *Christ's Natural Body*, to be at one time in more places than one. But if *Real*, *Essential* and **Corporal**, did not mean the same thing, 'twould not be against the Truth of *Christ's Natural Body*, to be at one time in more places than one: Because by this Construction, our Saviour's Body might be *Corporally present* only in one place, and yet at the same time be *Really and Essentially*, that is *Spiritually present*, at

the greatest Distances, which is plainly denied by the *Rubrick*. Farther, as another Reason against Adoration, 'tis affirm'd, that the *Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour*, are in Heaven and not here: But if *Real*, *Essential* and **Corporal**, are not of the same Signification, in this *Rubrick*, what should hinder our Saviour's *Natural Body*, from being in Heaven, and here, at the same Instant? For consider'd with tangible Qualities, and the other Train of **Corporeity**, 'twas only in Heaven: And yet, under the Notion of an immaterial Privilege, and a *Spiritual Presence*, it might be on Earth at the same time. Besides, the *Rubrick* made in *Edward VI. Reign*, and that now used, give the same Reasons against Adoration; from whence it follows, that the *Real*, *Essential*, and **Corporal Presence**, must come under the same Meaning: For if the Manner of *Presence* denied in one *Rubrick*, was different from that in the other, the same Reasons for prohibiting Adoration could not hold.

2^{dly}. By the Doctrine of the Church of Rome the *Real*, *Essential* and **Corporal Presence** in the *Holy Eucharist*, are only different Words for the same Thing.

Thus *Philpot*, Archdeacon of *Winchester*, is pronounced an Heretick for denying the *Real*, that is the *Corporal Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Altar*^q.

^q Fox. p. 580.

Dr. *Humphreys*, amongst other things, complains, that upon Q. Elizabeth's Accession to the Throne, the *Article in K. Edward's Reign of the Spiritual Manducation*, which clearly contradicted the *Real Presence*, and gave a full Explanation of the true Doctrine, was now publish'd maim'd and dock'd^r.

Thus we see the *Spiritual Manducation*, and the *Real Presence*, are plainly oppos'd, and mention'd as Contradictions to each other. ^r Bp. Burnet. ^r Hist. Refor. Pt. III. Records Book VI. Numb. 79. And does it not follow from hence, that in Dr. *Humphreys*'s Opinion, the *Real and Corporal Presence* were no more than two Words for the same Meaning?

Lastly, Whereas this learned Prelate suggests the *Affutors of Transubstantiation* don't maintain a *Corporal Presence*; for this must be his Opinion, otherwise his Recital has no manner of Force in't: I shall prove from authentick Authorities, that the *Corporal Presence* has been the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, ever since the publick defining of *Transubstantiation*. And tho' I'm not ignorant, that some Members of that Church, affirm that our Saviour's *Body*, is not present *Corporally*, but *Spiritually*, or as a Spirit is present; yet we are not to take the Sence of a Communion from such private, unauthoriz'd Hands. To put this Matter out of doubt, (which one would have thought need not have been prov'd) I shall only give two or three undeniable Instances.

First, The Council at Rome under Gregory VII obliged *Berengarius* to recant in this Form, that by the mysterious Force of the Consecration, the Bread and Wine are truly, properly and substantially changed into the true, proper and quickening Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. And Archbishop *Landfrank*, in his Answer to *Berengarius*, comes up to the same Form, and speaks plainly for a *Corporal Presence*.

Secondly,

An. Dom.
1215.

* Concil.
Labb. and
Coffart. Tom.
XL.

* Offa &
Nervos.

* Catechism.
ad Paroch.
P. 189, 193.
Edit. Lugdun.

^y Ep. Burnet's
Hist. Ref.
Pt. iii.
Pref. p. 5.

Secondly, The famous Council of Lateran under Innocent III. maintains, "That in the " Sacrament of the Altar, the Bread by the " Divine Omnipotence is Transubstantiated " into our Saviour's Body, and the Wine into " his Blood; that for the compleating the " mysterious Union between Christ, and his " Church, we may receive his Humane Na- " ture, as he was pleas'd to take ours".

Now if the Council believed our Saviour's Humane Nature was received in this Sacrament, as He took ours, they must by consequence maintain the Corporal Presence in the strictest Notion.

I shall conclude this Matter with the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, drawn by a committee appointed by the Council of Trent, and standing on the Authority of that Synod.

This *Catechisme*, made for the Instruction of the Parish Priests, acquaints us, that by the Words of Consecration, "The True Body of our Saviour, that Body which was born of the Blessed Virgin, and sits at the Right Hand of the Father in Heaven, is present in this Sacrament. And to make the Orthodoxy of this Article more apparent, "The Parochial Clergy are put in Mind to cite our Saviour's Words in their Sermons, This is my Body, and explain them to a literal Sence.

And Lastly, They are to inform their Audience, that whatever is included in the Essence and composition of a real Body, for Instance, Bones and Nerves^w, are contain'd and present in this Sacrament: They are farther to instruct their People, "That the whole Person of Christ, the Divine and Humane Nature, are join'd in this Mystery: That the most comprehensive Idea of both these Substances, and whatever is consequent to the Notion and Integrity of either of them; That is the Divinity, and entire Humane Nature; By which is to be understood, the Soul, the Blood, and all the parts of the Body: All this compasses of Nature, Properties, and Parts, are to be believ'd present in the holy Eucharist^x. Now whether these Testimonies don't amount to more than a Body's being spiritually present, if there's any Sence in that Expression, I leave the Reader to judge.

There is one extraordinary Observation in this Paragraph, which must not be overlook'd. This Learned Prelate observes, that the changing the Real and Essential, into the Corporal Presence, was chiefly procured by one D. P. G. soon after the Restoration of King Charles II. That the Person hinted by these Capitals, had a very extraordinary Subtlety for reconciling the Opinion of a Real Presence in the Sacrament, with the last words of the Rubrick. "That the Natural Body and Blood of Christ, were in Heaven, and not here, &c. And to what Expedient did He apply to bring these wonderful Things to a Consistency? Why he disengaged the Difficulty thus: A Body is in a Place, if there is no intermediate Body, but a Vacuum between it, and the Place. And He thought that by virtue of the words of Consecration, there was a Cylinder of a Vacuum between the Elements, and Christ's Body in Heaven; so that no Body being between, it was both in Heaven and in the Elements^y. By

the way, this D. P. G. who was guilty of this solemn piece of Folly^z, must be no worse^a. Ibid. Man than Dr. Peter Gunning: A Bishop of as great a Character for Learning, and Piety, as any then living in the Kingdom. As to the odd Manner of explaining this Mystery, I shall say nothing; But 'tis plain the Doctrine comes home to *Consubstantiation*. But that the famous Bishop Gunning was a Lutheran in this Point, is a Discovery I never heard of.

But let D. P. G. stand for whom you please; He must certainly be some Person of Figure, who had a Sway in the Convocation. Now I desire to know to what Purpose he solicited for this Alteration in the Rubrick? Upon what Motive did he procure the Change of the Real, or Essential, into the Corporal Presence? Did he suppose, tho' the Expression was altered, the Doctrine continued the same? If this was his Belief, what made him press for Amendments? To refine upon our First Reformers, can't well be done without something of Reflection: Constancy, as to Form and Opinions in an Ecclesiastical Legislature, is a recommending Circumstance, and argues a wise Settlement. This Person therefore must believe there was some strong Reason or Necessity for the Change; That is, He must suppose the Word *Corporal* comprehended a grosser Idea, and conveyed the Doctrine of *Trans*, or *Consubstantiation* with fuller Evidence, than *Real*, or *Essential*. Now if he believed the Term *Corporal*, delivered a different and bigger Meaning; what made him relinquish his own Alteration, and stick to the old Word *Real*? That he did so, is plain: For as this Learned Prelate assures us; He invented the *Cylinder* of a *Vacuum*, to reconcile the Opinion of the Real Presence with the last words of the Rubrick. But enough of this Matter; for by this time, I doubt not the Reader will see, that tho' a single Word was mistaken, the Sence remains perfectly the same.

But now at taking leave, I have a parting Blow. This Learned Prelate is pleas'd to say, *He should have a better Opinion of my Integrity, if I had professed my self not to be of his Communion, nor of the Communion of any other Protestant Church*^a. Had this Stroke been^a Pref. p. 6. well Aim'd, the Smart would have been pretty sensible; but as it happens, the Mark is quite missed, and I feel no Pain about it. I'm afraid our Learned Historian has fallen a little into Cardinal Pole's Misfortune, that he turn'd his Mind mostly to Eloquence; for here's much more Declamation than Argument^b. Tho'^b Bp. Burnet's if I'm not mistaken, unless the Logick is Hist. Ref. True, the Eloquence must be False. For Pt. iii. p. 126. Rhetorick is nothing but Reason well Dres'd and Argument put into Order.

However, that the Reader mayn't trust too far to the Figure of the Title Page, and be misled by a solemn Authority, I shall endeavour to remove the Imputation. And here I shall be brief in the Recital, and refer to Volume and Page for Justification: To begin with the Pope's Supremacy; This claim is endeavoured to be disprov'd from the Stile of the first Council of Arles, ^c from the Council of Sardica, and the general Council of Ephesus; Vol. I. p. 27, 8. From a Synod of the African Fathers in the Case

Case of *Apianus*; where they insist on their own Independence, and forbid Appeals to Transmarine Churches^a. From the British Churches, disowning *Austin* the Monk's pretences to Superiority, refusing Submission to Pope *Gregory the Great*; and from the Discourse between the Emperour *Constantius*, and

^a Id. p. 32,
33, 6.

^b Id. p. 76, 7.

^c Id. Vol. II.

p. 612.

^d Id. Vol. I.

p. 204, 6.

^e Id. p. 262.

^f Id. Vol. II.

p. 260.

^g Id. p. 356,

7, 8, 368.

^k Id. p. 98,

153, 263.

ⁱ Id. Vol. I.

p. 480, 1.

^m Id. p. 65, 6, us

139, 140, 141.

Councils of Frankford, and Paris;

from the *Caroline Books*, and from the Remonstrance of the English Church at that time. Farther, The Statutes against the Lollards, the Executions upon Heterodoxy, whether real or pretended, and the Cruelties on the score of Religion in Queen Mary's Reign, are related as counter-methods to the Spirit of Christianity, and condemn'd, in the Case of *Priscillian* by the Antient Church: And that in England, as low as the Reign of Edward III. Imprisonment, and not Burning, was the Punishment for Hereticks Convictⁿ.

Giving the Laity the Holy Eucharist only under one kind, remark'd a Departure from the Practice of the Catholick Church, for more than a thousand Years togetherⁱ.

The Worship of Images prov'd an Innovation from the Testimonies of St. Epiphanius^j, and Pope Gregory the Great^m;

from the *Caroline Books*, and from the Remonstrance of the English Church at that time. Farther, The Statutes against the Lollards, the Executions upon Heterodoxy, whether real or pretended, and the Cruelties on the score of Religion in Queen Mary's Reign, are related as counter-methods to the Spirit of Christianity, and condemn'd, in the Case of *Priscillian* by the Antient Church: And that in England, as low as the Reign of Edward III. Imprisonment, and not Burning, was the Punishment for Hereticks Convictⁿ.

There is likewise an Endeavour to prove that Prayers in an unknown Tongue, are plain Deviations from Scripture and Antiquity^o.

And Lastly, 'Tis observ'd that the Council of Trent's setting Scripture and Tradition upon an equal Foot of Authority, and extending the Canon to the *Apocrypha*^p, has differv'd the Union of Christendom^q, and gone off from Catholick Tradition^r.

These, as far as I understand, are the main Points in Controversy: This Disagreement is the Partition Wall between the two Churches of England and Rome; this fixes the Gulp, and makes a Coalition impracticable. And which way a Man that defends the Reform'd Side of all these Questions, can be fairly charg'd with Popery, is wholly beyond my Comprehension.

But it may be I have run my self upon Contradictions; pull'd down what I have built, disclaim'd Popery in one Part, and maintain'd it in another. I confess such Miscarriages are not without Example. Some celebrated Writers have fallen into Misfortunes of this kind. However, I challenge any Man to prove me guilty of any such Inconsistency, in either of the Volumes; or that I have asserted so much as a single Proposition insinuated in the Charge, either on the Heads above-mentioned, or any other.

I'm sensible some People count the Government and Practice of the Primitive Church,

and the decent Solemnities in Divine Worship, Remains of Popery. I own my self by no Means inclined to these Modern Extremities. To oppose every Thing believ'd and practis'd in the Church of Rome, is little less than Distraction. At this rate, we must throw away the Creed, and the Bible. And as King James I. argued against the *Dissenters*, *The Papists wear Shoes and Stockings, therefore we must go Barefoot*^s.

To return, If the arguing on the Reformation Side in the Points above-mention'd, are sufficient Discharges of Imputations towards Popery, I hope I may have given Satisfaction, especially considering there's no clashing, or falling foul of one Place upon another.

But if 'tis farther required I should have strain'd Ambiguities to the hardest Construction, made tragical Representations, and deliver'd my self in rough Language without Decency or Ground; that I should have bestow'd some warm Periods to exaggerate Matters, to highten Differences, and widen the Breaches in the Catholick Church: If 'twas my Busines to foment a Spirit of ill Nature, to enflame Animosities, and exasperate one Division of Christians against another: That I should have given, some loud repeated Warnings to secure a Quarter, where the Garrison is always upon Duty, and the Place sufficiently fortifyed: That I should have conjur'd up Mormoes, founded an Alarm against imaginary Dangers, and made People Fear, where no Fear is: That I should have battered a Party, watched by a general Dislike, inoffensive by want of Numbers, and disabled from making Disturbance, tho' never so willing: If 'tis expected I should have told some formidable Stories, (with the Proof quite out of sight,) to destroy the Confidence between Christian Princes of a different Communion^t; to make Treaties Impracticable, and maim all publick Correspondence: Tho' if such Relations should give an Impression, 'twould serve only to make the States of Christendom regardless of each others Interest, and disengaged to mutual Defence. 'Twould afford the Infidels an Opportunity to invade the Pale, and destroy the Plantations of the Apostles; To take down the Cross, and set up the Crescent, and leave the Mussulmen and Free-Thinkers to scramble for the World. In fine, If 'tis a fault not to have spent some Declamation upon these Heads, If silence upon these Topicks are reckon'd an omission, I must own my self guilty, and, which is somewhat more, I never intend to repent.

And now having gone through the Objections in his Preface, I should have stop'd here; had there not been two Passages in his History, in which I may be something concern'd. This Learned Historian bears hard upon Cavendish's Memory, taxes him with misreporting the Battle of Pavia, from thence concludes, he is little to be depended on, and owns withal, he has followed him too implicitly in his former Work^u.

I shan't examine at present, whether Cavendish and Guicciardine agree in this Relation: Let it be granted, the First may be somewhat in the Wrong; granting this, the Inference is by no means conclusive; For how does it follow

^t Conference
at Hampton-
Court.

^s Bp. Burnet's
Hist. Ref.
Part III.
p. 257.

^u Bp. Burnet's
Hist. Ref.
Pt. III. p. 38.

follow from his misrelating a Battle almost a Thousand Miles distant, that he is not to be depended on for Matters of Fact in the Family where he liv'd, and with which he may reasonably be supposed to be thoroughly acquainted? *Gavendish* who wrote *Woolsey's Life*, was a Man of Birth, employ'd upon the greatest Occasions, and this Cardinal's intimate *Domesick* through the whole Course of his Greatness to his Death ^v. As for his writing upon *Memory*, as this Learned Prelate affirms, there's no manner of Proof of his being no better furnish'd: On the contrary, his reciting his Master's Speeches and Discourses to a considerable length, his tracing the Cardinal's Fortune Step by Step, his giving the detail of Occurrences with so much Particularity and Circumstance, both with respect to Time and other Things; these are strong Indications he wrote upon *Memoires*, and probably the Cardinal's, as well as his own. Having sometimes cited this Gentleman's Book, I thought my self obliged to do him this Justice.

Our Learned *Historian* affirms 'tis plain, the 42 *Articles*, said in the Title to have been agreed on by Bishops and other learned Men in the Synod of London, Ann. 1552, did not

^w Bp. Burnet's pass in Convocation ^v. Against this Assertion ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll} ^{mm} ⁿⁿ ^{oo} ^{pp} ^{qq} ^{rr} ^{ss} ^{tt} ^{uu} ^{vv} ^{ww} ^{xx} ^{yy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{bb} ^{cc} ^{dd} ^{ee} ^{ff} ^{gg} ^{hh} ⁱⁱ ^{jj} ^{kk} ^{ll}

Reader may see more in the Preface to my first Volume.

Ibid.

³ Eccles. Hist.
Vol. I. p. 297.

The next Remark for Disadvantage, is my affirming Archbishop *Anselm held the right Side of the Question* in the Dispute with the King about owning Pope *Urban II.* s. I have given good Reasons for this Assertion, and am still of the same Opinion. But that *Anselm's Behaviour* in this Contest with *William Rufus*, was becoming a Prelate of his fervent Zeal, and invincible courage, as Bishop *Nicholson* suggests, is more than I have affirmed.

For another Fault (for every Passage quoted, must be suppos'd such) 'tis related that *Beecket's Conduct toward Henry II.* was also Innocent, as to any practice against the Crown; the Man having acted all along upon a Principle of Sincerity h.

⁴ English Hist.
Library, Ibid.

But here's a misrecital: I don't speak so decisively as this comes to: My Words are these, " As to any practice against the Crown, he SEEMS Innocent enough.

ⁱ Eccles. Hist.
Vol. I. p. 375.

" And he SEEMS all along to have acted on a Principle of Sincerity i. As for the Grounds of this fair Construction they are reported at large, and ought to have been disprov'd before the passing a Censure: But some critical Readers, I perceive, are apt to do strange Things.

But *Edward III's Letter to the Pope* (concerning Provisions) is said to misrepresent matter of Fact: Since under the Saxon Heptarchy, the English Bishops were not (as is there asserted) Creatures of the Crown k. To this I answer, There's a Salvo for the King's Honour premis'd to this Remark¹: And after this due Regard, what Crime is it to shew a Prince, or rather his Ministers, may be mistaken in Point of History? Who ever heard of an Infallible King? And where the Mistake is not a little unserviceable to the Christian Religion, I conceive an Historian oblig'd to discover it: And that his Majesty was misinform'd about Matter of Fact, is made good from several Instances of undeniable Authority m.

^k English Hist.
Libr. Ibid.

^l Eccles. Hist.
Vol. I. p. 547.

This Learned Prelate having done with my First Volume, passes on to the Second.

And here he begins his Complaint, that *Luther and Calvin, Knox and Fox*, are charg'd with Mistakes and Misbehaviour; that *Luther is represented as one upon the Verge of Dis- fraction* n.

ⁿ English Hist.
Libr. p. 117, 18.

But these are Bishop *Nicholson's* Words, not mine. And as for this German Divines raising civil Disturbances in the Empire, breaking the Chains of the Cannon Law, and going too great a length towards the other Extream; There's nothing deliver'd as my own Opinion; I only report what King *Henry VIII*, and *Thomas Munter*, lay to his Charge o. 'Tis true, I blamed *Luther* for great Indelicencies, and failing extravagantly in the Regards due to a Crown'd Head; but this was no more than the Case required. This Reformer afterwards recollect'd himself, ask'd the King's Pardon, and offer'd a Recantation p. And would this Reverend Prelate have had these material Passages suppress'd? Reparation to the King's Honour unrelated? and *Luther's* Repentance conceal'd?

^o Eccles. Hist.
Vol. II.
p. 21, 2.

^p Ibid.
^q Eccles. Hist.
Vol. II. p. 21.

Calvin, not to mention his outraging our Queen *Mary*, and calling her *Proserpine*, held a

Correspondence with that Incendiary *Knox*, caresses his Insults of the Government, and congratulates his Success q. *Beza* closes with a *Calvin Epist.* *Knox* in the same Principles, writes with ²⁸⁵ equal Warmth, and pushes the suppressing Episcopacy in a bitter Strain r.

^r Beza Epist.

'Tis true, Queen *Elizabeth* supported the Scots against their Sovereign, and assisted in some of these Commotions; but then she was a young Princess, and advis'd to these early Hostilities by her Council. They told her, the sending Troops against the Queen of Scots, was no more than Self-defence: That the landing Forces at *Leith* had made that Side the Aggressors: That the French design'd the Conquest of the Island, and that our Queen had no Way to preserve her Dominions, but by being aforesight.

^s Bp. Burnet's
Hist. Reform.
Part III.
Records, Book
VI, Numb. 54.

Whether the Politicks were overstrained in this Advice, whether these Precautions were justifiable or not, is more than I shall determine; However, at the worst, they were not without Face and Colour. But what Authority could *Knox* draw from this foreign Precedent? What pretence had this Divine to preach up an Insurrection? To lead on the People to the last Disorders of Ravage, Plunder, and Sacrilege t? Those who know the Scottish Constitution, and read their *Acts* of Parliament, will find such Sallies as those plainly unwarrantable. In fine, false Principles, short Learning, flaming Heat, and extravagant Assurance, are part of *Knox's* Character; And I am sorry Matter of Fact will make it no better.

As for *Fox*, his Temper is somewhat better govern'd, and I'm willing to believe him a Man of Probity. What he cites from Registers and Records, I find no Reason to question. But then, as Bishop *Burnet* observes, he might be too credulous in Writing such Things as were brought him by Report v. However, he was not a Person of the deepest Penetration. ^v Bp. Burnet's
Hist. Ref.
Part III.
Append. p. 394.

The rough usage himself and his Friends met with under Queen *Mary*, seems to have fowred his Humour and given him a Byafs. Thus his Zeal sometimes gets the better of his Judgment, and transports him to indefensible Conduct. To summ up this Matter in a Word or two. Upon *Luther* I shall observe nothing farther; but as to *Calvin* and the rest, their Reputation has not been serviceable in some Respects; neither have their Writings had any kind Effect upon the Repose of Christendom. What harm is it then to report their failings, and prevent their doing Mischief after they are dead? These Reformer's being right in many Things, and Men of a rais'd Character, makes their Authority the more dangerous when they miscarry. Why then should their Memory be privileg'd from Censure where they deserve it? Why should practical Errors, and unprimitive Conduct, lie cover'd and conceal'd? No benevolent Spirit in the other World, will thank an Author for such Ceremony as this. Unless I am much mistaken, 'tis the Busines of an Historian to mark Popular Mistakes, to keep his Reader from being surpriz'd with Names of Credit, and swallowing Diet and Poison together: Unless the Rocks and Sands are discover'd,

ver'd, the Ships which sail that Way, may possibly strike, and be lost.

To proceed. King Charles II. has a short ^{a Eccles. Hist.} Commendation, tho' not without some Alloy ^b. Vol. II. p. 904. But even this is disrelish'd by the Reverend ^c English Hist. Prelate. ^x He seems unwilling a good Word Libr. p. 118. should be given this Prince's Memory; and yet it can't be denied, the Three Nations flourisht through his Reign, and were left in Peace and Plenty. But he takes check at my laying, this King died with the *Faction at his Feet*.

With submission, a discontented Party that gave broad Signs of arresting the Government, and rising upon the Laws, may fairly be call'd a *Faction*: And these were the People his Majesty had reduced at his Death; But how long they lay afterwards in this disabled Posture, and whether they recover'd or not, was beyond my Period to examine.

This Reverend Prelate's last Observation, is surprizing beyond the rest. *What Views* however, says he, *the Author might have at his first setting out*, 'tis manifest that in this second Volume, his Business is to compromise Differences between the Churches of England and Rome; and to establish (on the Authority of our two Universities) a Fundamental Hereditary Right of Succession to the Crown, supported by Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance. ^y Libr. p. 118.

In answer to compromising Differences between the Churches of England and Rome, I need add nothing more than what has been already offer'd on this Head.

As for *Passive Obedience*, as the *Constitution* stood then, I think there's somewhat more produced, than the Authority of the Universities ^z. But as to *Hereditary Right*, &c. there's nothing establish'd, nor any Opinion interpos'd. ^{Marg.}

And tho' I thought it the Business of an Historian to give the Reader what passed upon critical Occasions, and report the Judgment of others; I have endeavour'd to stand clear of Politicks my self: And thus I have omitted a Detail of some Occurrences, on purpose to decline State-Controversy, and prevent Misconstruction.

Besides, *Non-Resistance* is no incomunicable Privilege, not *proprium quarto modo* to *Hereditary Title*: Elective Monarchies, and *Common Wealths*, may bind the Subject as close

as this comes to. The *Roman Empire* was elective, and yet the *Lex Regia* made the Prince absolute; Neither do we find any Reservations for the People to redress their Grievances by Force. And I believe it would be some difficulty to produce a legal Warrant in the Government of *Venice* or *Holland*, for the Subjects to levy an Army, and call the *Magnificacy* to an Account. I confess I never heard of any express Liberty, and publick Provision, made for this purpose, unless in the *Charters* of *Andreti the Second*, King of *Hungary*^a, and *John King of England*^b. And in this latter Instrument, there was a Clause of Security for the *Crown*. 1st, The *Barons* were not to hurt the King's Person, or any of his Children. And 2^{dly}, When they had made themselves Reparation, for what had been suffer'd, they were to return to their Allegiance as before. Thus we see *Passive Obedience* may be claim'd by every Species of Government, and therefore can be no peculiar Support to *Hereditary Right*. And why the *First* should be charg'd as a Principle to establish the *Latter*, is not easily accounted for. I can't forbear saying, the Tacking these Two together for such significant Service, is extraordinary Justice! And that the Force and Friendlynes of all his Observations are equally remarkable.

^a Thuan: Count Teckley's Life.

^b Math. Parisi

POSTSCRIPT.

April 2. 1715.

BY the favour of a Gentleman uncommonly well furnish'd with Curiosities of the Press, I have at last gotten a sight of the *Ordinal*, Printed Anno. 1549. Upon perusal, I find the *Bible* laid on the Bishop's Neck, the *Pastoral Staff* put in his Hand, and the *Chalice* with Bread in it, for the Priest, some of the *Consecrating*, and *Ordaining* Ceremonies.

FINIS.

